

Peer and Self Error Correction Process of Speaking Performance in English Speaking Community at University

Putri Sakinah

English Education Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts, The State University of Surabaya
putrisakinah@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

English Speaking Community adalah salah satu cara terbaik untuk mengaktifkan keterampilan berbicara siswa di luar kelas. Kegiatan ini memungkinkan siswa untuk belajar melalui *peer learning* di mana guru tidak terlibat langsung di dalamnya. Namun, dalam kemampuan berbicara, siswa diharapkan untuk memperbaiki kesalahan dan belajar dari kesalahan yang mereka buat. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini menguji proses mengoreksi kesalahan teman dan diri mereka sendiri kemampuan berbicara siswa saat melakukan kegiatan di English Speaking Community. Penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif dimana observasi dan wawancara digunakan sebagai metode pengumpulan data. Dua kelompok diamati dalam penelitian ini. Observasi direkam menggunakan rekaman audio dan ditranskripsikan ke dalam transkripsi pengamatan data. *Field-notes* juga digunakan untuk memudahkan analisis data. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa siswa biasanya melakukan kesalahan dalam pengucapan, aturan tata bahasa, pilihan kosakata, dan kesalahan berbasis strategi komunikasi. Proses koreksi juga menunjukkan bahwa siswa melakukan koreksi diri dalam dua cara; koreksi diri langsung dan koreksi diri yang tertunda. Sementara dalam mengoreksi teman, siswa melakukan mengoreksi secara langsung, mengoreksi secara tertunda, dan mengoreksi secara diskusi. Namun, penelitian ini menemukan bahwa sebagian besar siswa tidak mengoreksi kesalahan. Dengan demikian, wawancara terhadap tiga siswa dilakukan untuk mengetahui alasan mengapa mereka cenderung tidak memperbaiki kesalahan. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa sebagian besar siswa tidak mengenali kesalahan, mereka lebih fokus pada kegiatan berbicara daripada kesalahan yang dibuat, merasa tidak enak jika mereka memperbaiki kesalahan, dan mereka ingin untuk memotong waktu.

Kata Kunci: *pengoreksian diri sendiri, pengoreksian teman, produksi kesalahan, kemampuan berbicara.*

Abstract

English Speaking Community is one of the best ways to activate students' speaking skill outside the classroom. This activity allows students to learn through peer learning in which lecturers are not directly involved in it. However, in speaking performance students are expected to correct errors in order to learn from the mistakes they make. Thus, this study examines the process if peer and self error correction in students' speaking performance in English Speaking Community. This study used qualitative descriptive research in which observation and interview were conducted as the data collection method. Two groups were observed in this study. The observation was recorded into audio recording and transcribed into observation transcription. Filed notes were also used to ease the data analysis. The result showed that students usually commit errors in their pronunciation, grammar rule, vocabulary choice, and communication strategy-based error. The process of correction also showed that students conducted self-correction in two ways; they are direct self-correction and delayed self-correction. While in peer correction, students conducted direct peer correction, delayed peer correction, and discussion peer correction. However, this study found that students were mostly not to correct error. Thus, interview towards three students were conducted to know the reason why they tended not to correct error. Here, the result showed that students mostly didn't recognize the errors, they preferred to focus on the speaking rather than the errors, felt bad if they corrected errors, and they intended to cut out the time.

Keywords: *self-correction, peer correction, error production, speaking performance.*

INTRODUCTION

An English Speaking Community now is one of the best ways to activate speaking ability for both EFL and ESL students. According to Pereira et.al (2013), Novitasari (2016), Dewi (2016), and Angga (2016), an activity such as English Speaking Community promotes

learners to be the active users of the language. English Speaking Community is usually conducted by the group of students who are willing to speak English. Students can join the club without any pressure because they need English. In the other hand, some institutions provide this activity program as a requirement for the students who

want to pass the English subject, such as in English Department at one of the university in Surabaya. The department requires the students to get involved into the program. They need to reach a certain level in order to be able to take certain courses. For example, students need to be on the level 7 if they want to take their thesis program. At least, the department hopes that the students have a good speaking skill afterwards.

English Department at provides English Speaking Community (ESC) to facilitate students in using English as much as possible. Bhattacharjee (n.d.) agrees that some school and institutions have privilege to conduct this English Speaking Program to support the English use. This kind of program hopefully fulfils the students' need to enhance their speaking skill and helps students in mastering the target language (Pereira et al., 2013). English Speaking Community is also a kind of study group in which is an alternative way to boost the students to have a discussion about their learning progress outside the class. It provides peer learning activity in which students can discuss the learning problems and how to overcome them. Students are also able to conduct the ESC outside the class or even outside the campus. They can conduct ESC in the city library, cinema, or swimming pool. The department claims that students can conduct the ESC wherever they want in order to reduce anxiety and build an interesting and different group learning while students can enhance their speaking performance outside the class.

However, since English is spoken as a second language for the students, it is quite common that errors and mistakes are found in students speaking performance during ESC. Error is defined as a combination production of linguistic form with similar context, which in this case, produced by the L2 speakers (Lennon, 1991). Also, students usually have lack of background knowledge and they do not know whether they commit errors. In several studies, students commonly commit errors in grammatical structure and pronunciation as the aspect of speaking performance, yet vocabularies and meaning (word choices) are also considered to be errors (Jing, Xiaodong, & Yu, 2016; Uysal & Aydin, 2017; Woods, 1989). In the other hand, mistakes and errors indicate to build a progress in learning languages and enhance its concept (Irfani, 2014). Thus, errors shouldn't be ignored in order to improve language learning and language form (Woods, 1989).

Since ESC is considered to a study group, the department hopes that students can discuss the obstacles during their study and manage to solve them. As the result, peer correcting is basically needed in speaking performance. Students who are aware whether they or their friends commit errors are expected to correct their

error. Therefore, students will reduce anxiety while their friends correct their error rather than corrected by the teacher (Botha, 1987; Gudu, 2015). Correcting errors is also important for the students in order to enhance their awareness in language use. Hence, students need correction while they learn language (Moini, 2009).

Error correction can be conducted in several ways. Studies show that there are three types of error correction; they are self correction, peer correction, and teacher correction (Ganji, 2009; Jing et al., 2016; Moini, 2009; Uysal & Aydin, 2017). Yet, since this study is conducted in English Speaking Community in which students can conduct a discussion in group without monitoring from the teacher, there are only two ways in correcting error; self correction and peer correction.

Self-correction defines as the ability of students to correct their own errors. They notice that they commit errors and try to correct them before their other friends doing so (Khosa et al., 2016). Khosa et al. claimed that for undergraduate students, the frequency of self-correction in speaking performance was applied very limited because of minor monitoring role. Yet, in their study regarding the self-correction phenomenon in speaking performance for undergraduate students, they also believed that self-correction could bring students into better linguistic competency.

Meanwhile, Peer correction defines as the ability of the students to analyse their friends' error and correct them. Prihatini (2015) believed that peer correction allows the students to help others in correcting the error production in language features during the speaking performance. This technique is now being the consideration in second language learning because peer correction can lower students' anxiety and improve the supportive atmosphere for the students (Sultana, 2009).

In productive skill, such as writing and speaking performance, it is essential to conduct correction and feedback to build a better understanding in constructing the language knowledge (Botha, 1987). A study conducted by Ganji (2009) examined the impact of teacher correction, peer correction, and self-correction in writing performance and he found that peer correction and self-correction were more effective in improving students' writing composition and accuracy rather than teacher correction. Other study found that error correction strategies in oral classroom depends on the teachers' ability in managing error and students' confidence to do so (Jing et al., 2016). Uysal and Aydin (2017) explained that in foreign language classroom teaching, teacher's correction can contribute into students' self-correction to be more aware of their language production and guide them to conduct a peer correction. In addition, a study by Sultana (2009) gives the evidence that peer correction has

its benefit in ESL classroom in order to built collaborative learning among the students. Also, a study by Kosha et al. (2016) that examined self-correction in undergraduate students' speaking performance claimed that it could increase students' linguistic competence.

According to Uysal and Aydin (2017), errors lead into better learning by constructing feedback and giving effective treat. They argue that correcting error seemingly improve the accuracy of grammar and vocabulary knowledge and build the pronunciation skills. Here, students who conduct ESC are expected to give feedback and make a group study in order to reach the goal of ESC itself. Thus, error correction is important to gain students' understanding in speaking skill.

However, ESC is claimed that it can give the opportunity for the students to learn in group and students can share their knowledge to correct errors production. In the other hand, from the preliminary study, it is found that students tend not to correct their error or their friends' error.

In addition, the L2 learners deals with how they receiving the language focusing on its form and its meaning. Formed-focused occurs while at the early stage of the L2 study and students tend to be the observer of the language as they achieving the aspect of the languages (Woods, 1989). However, different from the beginner learner, the university student especially who study English they tend to focus on the meaning while receiving the language. Thus, meaning-focused occurs as they tend to achieve the meaningful communication and less grammatical correctness (Chuang, n.d.).

Students' awareness in correcting errors deals with their ability in analysing the linguistic competence including grammatical and phonological rule, and also vocabulary. Woods (1989) argued that teachers' strategies in form-focused communication could lead the students' awareness in composing the language form and the sense of others' mistake. He also claimed that communicative feedback in necessary in second language learning. Thus, a form-focused strategy is also a beneficial to students' grammatical correction in learning the second language (Lightbown & Spada, 1990). Furthermore, form-focused strategy leads the students to correct error in language use.

Meanwhile, the different approach focus on meaningful usage of language in real life situation appears as the Natural Approach's technique that allows the students to spend little time in linguistic part of the language and focus on the meaning of the communicative instruction (Krashen & Terrel, 1983 as cited in Saeidi, Zaferanieh, & Shatery, 2012). Thus, students tend to focus on the meaning of the language input rather than to focus on its form in linguistic competence.

Based on the case above, it is necessary to conduct a research about error correction process of the students' speaking performance with three research questions formulated:

1. In what way do students commit errors in speaking performance?
2. How do students conduct the process of self-correction in speaking performance?
3. How do students conduct the process of peer-correction in speaking performance?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A descriptive qualitative research was used in this study. Since this study examine the naturalistic experiment while conducting the research, it is an essential to conduct a qualitative research to investigate the detail experience in social content and behaviour (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010, p. 420; Bhattacharjee, 2012, p. 114; Richards, 2003, p. 1). However, this research examined the error correction in students' speaking performance during the English Speaking Community in English Department at one of the university in Surabaya. Here, the data collection in this study was started on late March and finished in the middle of May. The subjects of this research were two groups of ESC students in English Department at one of the university in Surabaya. Each group consisted of four students including one group leader. The source of data in this study was the utterance of students' speaking performance while conducting the ESC and the utterance of the interviewee from the interview. Students' utterance in speaking performance while they were conducting the ESC became the main data of this study regarding students' error production and how they managing errors, both self error correction and peer error correction in speaking performance.

The data collection methods for this study were observation and interview. Both observation and interview were the technique that commonly used in qualitative research (Ary et al., 2010, pp. 431–438; Bhattacharjee, 2012, p. 108). Here, field notes were used as the method to collect the data in this observation (Ary et al., 2010, p. 435). Here, field-notes give brief information regarding: 1.) students' oral production; 2.) self-correction process; 3.) peer-correction process. The second method was semi-structured interview with open ended question which was used to uncover the reasons why students tend not to correct error. A semi structured interview with open ended was used to investigate the specific area of this research while the questions were formulated to give the interviewees a chance to response.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Error Production in Students' Speaking Performance in English Speaking Community.

Errors are very common in students speaking performance since they perform English as the second language. Uysal and Aydin (2017) and Jing et al. (2016) mentioned that there are four types of error that usually made by students, they are pronunciation error, grammatical error, vocabulary error, and communication strategy-based strategy error.

The result of two groups observed showed that they reportedly committed the same common error in speaking performance. Grammatical error was the most common error that students commit in speaking performance, followed by pronunciation error, vocabulary error, and the last one was communication strategy-based error, while in Group 2 there was no student who committed error in communication strategy-based error.

Grammatical error defines as the errors that are made by students because they produce wrong grammatical word, phrase, or sentences. This type of error is commonly made by the students during their speaking performance in which grammatical error produced mostly in structural agreement. For example in the first group, such as (1) "So that means I am.. I am the win, and you're out?" in which the underlined word should have been 'winner'. the other one is in the utterance (2) "Rian Reynold, she is the actor of..." that the underlined word should be 'he' because Rian Reynold is a man.

- (1) S2 : "So that means I am.. I am the win, and you're out?"
S3 : "Yeah.."
- (2) S3 : "No, I've never heard about that."
S2 : "Ryan Reynolds, she is the actors of 'Deadpool'."
S3 : "Yeah, I know that but I don't know the name."

Pronunciation error refers to errors that students' make are based on the wrong pronunciation. The example of this type of error is two students in group one tended to pronounce *answer* with /'a:nsʊə(r)/ rather than to pronounce it with the correct one, /'a:nsə(r)/ (1). This wrong pronunciation in the word *answer* happened several times, and one of the students tended to always say *answer* with the wrong pronunciation. This wrong pronunciation in the word *answer* happened several times, and one of the students tended to always say *answer* with the wrong pronunciation. Another example is the word *should* that one student in group two tended to

say it as /ʃʊld/ rather than the correct one, /ʃʊd/. She also said the word *should* several times wrong (2).

- (1) S2 : "So, you make it a question and you should know about the answer."
S1 : "Yes."
S2 : "Yeah, okay. I know that."
- (2) S1 : "Um... And that I have any comments for, Fara for grammar, such as when you say uh.. like, 'she' or 'he' and then it's uh.. in the.. the next word is about adjective, I think you should uh.. add any 'to be', something like that.. And then, yeah.. "

Vocabulary error appears as errors caused by the lack of students' knowledge in word, phrase, or the sentence choice. This error makes the students' utterance non-senses and does not sound like English language. The result showed that students rarely committed to this type of error. The example of this error is when a student in group one uttered (1) "Is that a girl or boy?" where the underlined words should have been 'a women or a man' because the students here talked about the character that lead into an elderly person not the teenager. Another example is the utterance (2) "He has a tattoo, so a lot.." that the underlined phrase does not sound like English, thus the phrase uttered could be changed as 'so many tattoos' or 'a lot of tattoos' or simply uttered as 'a lot'.

- (1) S3 : "Yeah, the person."
S2 : "Is that a girl or boy?"
S3 : "Not boy, it's a man."
- (2) S3 : "Uh.. I don't know."
S2 : "He has a tattoo, so a lot and he's handsome.. (laughing)"
S1 : "Okay, just cut."

Communication strategy-based error comes up because the students utters a phrase or sentences that other students cannot understand about what it is about. In group one, communication strategy-based error occurred because there is one of the students that has speech disorder, in which he sometimes couldn't say words properly. He also sometimes talked circularly which make confusion to the other friends. The example of this error (4) "...I will be will point who choose who we would see, who's he can could be the most likely to be false..". In this utterance, the speaker might want to say "... I will point out and choose who is seen as the most likely to be false." because here, the students were playing a game and the speaker tended to explain the rule.

- (1) S1 : "Just say.. Just this, just take while

sleep before you make an answer, then after.. after that then, I will be will point who choose who we would see, who's he can could be the most likely to be false."

S3 : "Yep."

S4 : "Okay."

Self-correction in Students' Speaking Performance in English Speaking Community

Self-correction deals with students' awareness to correct their own errors. This study found that there are two types of self-correction in speaking performance in English Speaking Community.

a. Direct Self-Correction

Direct self-correction occurred when the students made error and they recognized the error they made and directly correct it. The example of this type of correction is shown below:

S2 : "Uh.. (laughing) Okay, pemanasan.. Warm.. warm-up, warm up.. The easy.. easiest, easiest.."

An utterance above was from Student 2 in group one, she uttered 'The easy' and she recognize that she made mistake. Then, she corrected her mistake with "The easy.. easiest, easiest..". Another example is from the same person, she uttered:

S2 : "Yeah, don't you know last time David Beckham come to.. came to Indonesia and.. especially Jakarta and Semarang, and as a UNICEF Ambassador....."

She corrected her grammatical error from 'come to' into 'came to'. Students who directly corrected their mistakes usually conscious what they uttered wrong and they did not need to take long time to correct it.

b. Delayed Self-Correction

Delayed self-correction occurred when students made mistake and they took time to correct it. The example is shown below:

S1 : "The question is, in which country 'Epic Sax-Guy' (pronouncing sax as /sex/) came from?"

S3 : "'Epic Sex-Guy'? Who is the 'Epic Sex-Guy'?? (laughing)"

S2 : "What is that??"

..... (long conversation)

S1 : "Uh.. sorry, sorry. Sax, sax, epic sax, saxophone."

S3 : "Oh saxophone?? (giggling)"

The example above when the Student 1 made a pronunciation mistake when he pronounced 'sax', an

abbreviation from saxophone, and he pronounced it as 'sex' so that it made his friends acted strange. Thus, he knew that he made a wrong pronunciation and he corrected it. It took almost five minutes for him to recognize his mistake.

Peer correction in Students' Speaking Performance in English Speaking Community

Peer correction deals with students' awareness to correct their friends' errors. This study found that there are three types peer correction in speaking performance in English Speaking Community.

a. Direct Peer Correction

Direct peer correction occurred when the students directly correct their friends' error. Direct peer correction might lead into interruption while their friends were speaking because they tried to correct the error. The example of direct peer correction from group two is shown below

S1 : "Uh-uh.. I have topics and then, it's about homeless.. homeless is caused (wrong pronunciation) low moral."

S3 : "Caused. (correcting wrong pronunciation)"

The utterances above show that Student 3 tried to correct the mistake of Student 1 where Student 1 made a pronunciation error. However, in this case, Student 1 tend to ignore the correction given. Another example was from group one with conversation shown below

S2 : "Japan? (wrong pronunciation)"

S1 : "Japan? (correcting the pronunciation) No, false."

S2 : (nodded)

The utterances above showed that Student 2 made a pronunciation mistake and was corrected by Student 1. Here, Student 1 corrected Student 2 by asking the correct pronunciation and Student 2 nodded.

b. Delayed Peer Correction

Delayed peer correction occurred when the students recognized the mistake and they still needed exact time to correct it. Or, this could happen when one student made the same mistake several times and then another friend finally recognize the mistake and correct it. The example of delayed peer correction from group one is shown below

S2 : "One, two, three.. One, two, three.. Yes! What's the soundtrack, what's the soundtrack of France (wrong pronunciation) movie that, uh.. I mean, I mean what's the name of France (wrong pronunciation) movie of this song? This song is..

- I will sing at this song 'Dreams are my reality na na na na...' (singing).."*
- S4 : *"Oh my god, I've ever heard about that song."* (long conversation)
- S2 : *"Yeah in France, in France, in France (wrong pronunciation) title or English is up to you."*
- S1 : *"Francis? France (correcting pronunciation)?"*
- S2 : *"Yeah."*
- S4 : *"France (correcting pronunciation) language or English."*

The example of conversation above showed that Student 2 made a pronunciation mistake. Here, her friends recognize the mistake yet they did not correct it until Student 1 corrected her pronunciation.

c. Discussion Peer Correction

Here, discussion peer correction depended on the group itself. It also because of the Group Leaders whether they wanted to conduct the discussion or not. In group 1 case, they did not conduct discussion because they had never done that before. Yet, in group 2 case, they usually conducted a discussion as an example bellow

- S1 : *"And then guys.. From the whole topic, do you find any problem?"*
- S3 : *"Uh.. well, because I have some kind of uh.. an easy feeling to pronunciation, but clearly I know some, when Ahmad say 'wrong', you say 'rong' without 'w', so the /w/ in the first one doesn't mention, I mean doesn't spelt in there, so it's 'rong' not 'wrong', but just 'rong'. And in the some reason when we.. Uh.. Ahmad, yeah, and for some words like, uh.. 'me' better you replace it with 'myself' not 'me'. It will be uh.. more polite in that way, I think. Yeah that's for everyone. Uh.. that's what I think, actually."*

The example above discussed the pronunciation and vocabulary error made by Student 4. Here, Student 3 explained what errors he made and he tried to find the correct one. Another discussion peer correction example from group 2 that talked about grammatical errors

- S1 : *"Um... And that I have any comments for, Fara for grammar, such as when you say uh.. like, 'she' or 'he' and then it's uh.. in the.. the next word is about adjective, I think you should uh.. add any 'to be', something like that.. And then, yeah.."*

Student 1, as the Group Leader, explained the error made by Student 2 and she also gave the correct example of the error. Bellow also shows conversation from group 2 that discussed the pronunciation error.

- S4 : *"Recently just I heard Dan said 'should' (pronouncing /shud/) not 'should' (pronouncing /shuld/), so I heard that she said should (pronouncing /shuld/)not should (pronouncing /shud/), it's like when you sell something, sold, no, should."*
- S3 : *"Sold.. sold.. (giggling)"*
- S1 : *"Oh.. okay, okay, okay.."*
- S4 : *"So it's you should (pronouncing /shud/), you should (pronouncing /shud/),"*
- S1 : *"You should (pronouncing /shud/) yeah.."*

In conversation above, Student 4 found that Student 1 made an error in pronouncing 'should', thus he corrected Student 1 error and gave the correct example of the pronunciation.

Self and Peer Correction: Never

However, in this study found that students tend not to correct error. They mostly kept speaking rather than correcting errors. To follow up the result of this study, a discussion about why students tend not to correct errors, both their friends' errors or their own errors, three students were interviewed to support the result of this study.

From the interview conducted to three students regarding why they did not correct errors, they all agreed that correcting error was important. They claimed that English Speaking Community was place where students could improve speaking skill, thus ESC was the place to learn together with friends. Here are as the Student A said, *"In my opinion actually it's very important since ESC intention is to improve our conversation or in speaking skill."* and also Student B said *"Oh ya, I think it's important because in ESC we learn and the purpose of ESC I think is to improve our speaking skill because in ESC we practice how to speak and speak and then we know about new vocabulary, new words, new topic, new knowledge."* Student C claimed *"Yes, because in ESC we learn together, we have um.. we also learn from others.."* that she wished she could learn from other friends.

Thus, even though the students claimed that they needed to correct errors in English Speaking Community since it was the place to improve their speaking ability, they still tend not to correct errors.

However, the main reason why students tend not to correct error because they do not realize the errors they make. All the students also agreed that the most important thing in speaking in let focus on the speaking, not the error the speaker's made. This deals with the concept of meaning-focused in second language learning that the students more focusing on the meaning rather than correcting errors. Another reason that came up is

students sometimes feel bad to correct and no rights to correct errors. The last reason why students tend not to correct error during their ESC is because they want to cut the time. Since this activity asks the students to spend their time outside the classroom, students need to spare their time for ESC. Yet, this makes students feel a half heart to do an ESC.

CONCLUSION

English Speaking Community is a place where students are able to experience learning speaking outside the classroom. This activity also allows students to express and learn with friends as free as possible since there is no direct monitoring from the lecturer. Thus, English Speaking Community is suitable for students to explore peer learning. However, this study was conducted to examine self and peer correction in students' speaking performance in English Speaking Community.

Here, this study also takes a look at students' errors. Errors that usually students make are pronunciation error, grammatical error, vocabulary error, and communication strategy-based error. This study shows that mostly students commit error on their pronunciation and grammatical rule. This might happen because the different rule between the L1 and the target language. Also in this study, communication strategy-based error occurred because one student had a speech disorder that made him suffer to speak fluently.

Since students commit errors, they are expected to correct those errors. Here, this study examined to see how they perform both self-correction and peer correction. In self-correction, it was found that students performed direct self-correction and delayed self-correction. Also in peer correction, students usually performed direct peer correction, delayed peer correction, and discussion peer correction.

However, since students also tend not to correct error, further research was conducted to take a look why students are doing so. The result shows that students agreed the importance of correction, yet they mostly tend not to correct error because they do not recognize that their friends' or they themselves commit errors. Other reasons are they prefer to focus on the speaking rather than to correct error since they get the meaning of what the speaker is talking about, and they sometimes feel bad to correct their friends' errors because they think that it is not their right to correct them. The last reason why students tend not to correct error because they wanted to cut out the time since English Speaking Community was outside their scheduled-class.

SUGGESTION

As the result shows before, some suggestions are given regarding the students ability to manage errors in speaking performance. This also deals with their pronunciation and grammar as they become the most likely errors students tend to commit. Thus, it is important to emphasize and maximize the existence of pronunciation and grammar class.

Further, as many students tend not to correct error in their speaking performance in English Speaking Community because they claimed that they focus on speaking rather than the error, then it would be suitable if each group to conduct a discussion peer correction at the end of the ESC session. It might lower the anxiety of the speaker of being corrected during their speaking. Also in discussion, students tend to be able to explore what is wrong in their friends', or even their own speaking performance.

In addition, this study can be a reference to conduct further research about self and peer error correction. However, for the future study, it is better to conduct the research based on the result and what suggested above in order to explore the detail information about the specific issue, for example, how to maximize the pronunciation class for university students. Thus, the next study will be able to help students lower their errors.

REFERENCES

- Angga, E. I. D. (2016). Analysis of Arguments in English Department Sstudents' Speaking.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th Ed). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bhattacharjee, N. (n.d.). Developing Speaking Skill at Secondary and Higher Secondary Levels : Problems and Few Recommendations, 15–29.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). Social Science Research : Principles , Methods , and.
- Botha, H. L. (1987). The role of error correction in communicative second language teaching, 3(2), 46–51.
- Chuang, Y. (n.d.). A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Focus-on-form and Meaning-focused Instructions in the English Classroom, 1–14.
- Dewi, F. (2016). Turn taking in the conversation produced by members of English speaking community at Surabaya state university, 4(3), 64–72.
- Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction , Peer-correction and Self- correction : Their Impacts on Iranian Students ' IELTS Essay Writing Performance, 6(1), 117–139.
- Gudu, B. O. (2015). Teaching Speaking Skills in English Language using Classroom Activities in Secondary

- School Level in Eldoret Municipality , 6(35), 55–63.
- Irfani, B. (2014). Error Correction and Feedback in Speaking: A Comparative Study of Teacher (Lecturer) and Student Preferences in Responding Students ' Errors in Speaking At English Education Study Program, 8–18.
- Jing, H., Xiaodong, H., & Yu, L. (2016). Error Correction in Oral Classroom English Teaching, 9(12), 98–103.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n12p98>
- Moini, M. R. (2009). The impact of EFL teachers ' cognition on teaching foreign language grammar, (49), 141–164.
- Novitasari, A. (2016). Powerful nad powerless speeches among students in English speaking community: Types of speech styles, 4, 1–8.
- Pereira, A. H., Ismail, K., & Othman, Z. (2013). A Model for the Malaysian English Language Club Activities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90(InCULT 2012), 48–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.064>
- Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Hampshire and Ner York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Uysal, N. D., & Aydin, S. (2017). Foreign Language Teachers ' Perceptions of Error Correction in Speaking Classes : A Qualitative Study, 22(1), 123–135.
- Woods, D. (1989). Error Correction and the Improvement of Language Form, 6(2), 60–72.

